DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 786 TM 003 147

AUTHOR	Tyrrel, Tom G.
TITLE	Title I in South Dakota. Evaluation Report Fiscal Year 1970.
INSTITUTION	South Dakota State Dept. of Public Instruction, Pierre.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	32p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; Community Involvement; *Compensatory Education Programs; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Grades; Expenditures; *Federal Programs; Inservice Education; Parent Participation; Preschool Education; *Program Evaluation; Secondary Grades; Statistical Data; Student Testing; Tests
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *South Dakota

ABSTRACT

Results of the evaluation of the 244 Title I programs in South Dakota for the fiscal year 1970 are provided. The sections of the report are as follows: Purpose of Evaluation; Basic State Statistics; State Department Staff Visits; Changes in SEA Procedures; Effect upon Educational Achievement; Effects on Administrative Structure and Education Practices; Additional Efforts to Help Disadvantaged; Success of Title I in Nonpublic Schools; Teacher-Teacher Aide Training Programs; Community and Parental Involvement; Major Problem Areas; and Financial Data. (DB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 081783

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TITLE I

Evaluation ..

Fiscal Year 1970

Special Programs For Educationally Deprived Children

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TITLE I P.L. 89-10

PIERRE, S. DAK. 57501

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TM 003 147

ED 081786

EVALUATION REPORT
FISCAL YEAR 1970

TITLE I IN SOUTH DAKOTA

DON BARNHART
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

LYNDON M. LOKEN, *Coordinator*
TOM G. TYRRELL, *Evaluator*

Title I, E.S.E.A.
Department of Public Instruction
Pierre, South Dakota

INTRODUCTION

Federal guidelines for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 require that projects be evaluated annually at the local, state, and federal level.

The basic information contained in this Fiscal Year 1970 Evaluation Report was obtained from the individual evaluation reports required from each local educational agency participating in Title I in South Dakota.

This report is designed according to the recommended outline provided by the U. S. Office of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY	
Purpose of Evaluation	1
Basic State Statistics	1
Operating LEA's	1
Participating LEA's	1
Title I Programs, FY 1970	2
Student Participation	3
State Department Staff Visits	4
Changes in SEA Procedures	5
Quality of Title I Programs	5
Insured participation of Nonpublic Schools	5
Modification of Local Projects in Light of State and Local Evaluation	6
Effect Upon Educational Achievement	7
Impact Upon Reading Achievement	7
Most Commonly Used Tests	11
Major Objectives of Reading, Kindergarten, and Mathematics	12
Common Characteristics	13
Evidence of Effectiveness Related to Cost	14
Effects on Administrative Structure and Education Practices	14
State	14
Local	15
Nonpublic	15
Additional Efforts to Help Disadvantaged	16
Funds Used to Augment Title I Programs	16
Description of Outstanding Example	16

Success of Title I in Nonpublic Schools 18

Number of Projects 18
Quality of Projects 18
Time Projects were Offered 18
Adaptations to Meet Educational Needs 18
Changes in Legal Interpretation 18
Joint Planning with Nonpublic Schools 18

Teacher-Teacher Aide Training Programs 19

Number of Programs 19
Participants and Cost 19
Specific Examples 20
Patterns of Activities 21

Community and Parental Involvement 22

Nature and Extent 22
Outstanding Example 22

Major Problem Areas 25

Financial Data. 26

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The purpose of Title I evaluation is to provide a sound basis for determining whether programs are to be modified, intensified, or shifted in terms of objectives and activities. Evaluation is essential to secure quantitative and qualitative evidence to ascertain the impact of Title I on disadvantaged youth.

Conscientious evaluation of Title I projects will aid (1) in diagnosing the participant's strengths and weaknesses, (2) in prescribing a plan of action based on the diagnosis, (3) in developing immediate and long-range planning to meet the project objectives, (4) in determining if the participant's educational attainment has been raised, and (5) in adding to our knowledge of ways to effectively educate children with specific educational needs.

Evaluation must do more than just "pass" or "fail" a project. It must determine why that project was or was not effective in closing the educational gap.

BASIC STATE STATISTICS

The following information indicates the participation of Local Educational Agencies and Institutions for Neglected Children (Non-State supported) in ESEA, Title I programs for Fiscal Year 1970.

There were a total of 657 operating Local Educational Agencies in the State.

South Dakota had 394 Local Educational Agencies participating in Title I.

(1) 157 LEA's participated during the regular school term.
(2) 8 LEA's participated during the summer term.
(3) 229 LEA's participated during the regular school and summer term.

South Dakota's rate of participation is shown in Table I for fiscal year 1966 - 1970.

TABLE I

SOUTH DAKOTA'S RATE OF
PARTICIPATION IN TITLE I

Year	Total LEA's	Eligible LEA's	Participating LEA's
FY 66	2379	2327	836
FY 67	2250	1208	680
FY 68	1804	1118	660
FY 69	1049	717	556
FY 70	657	473	394

There were 244 Title I programs for Fiscal Year 1970. This total includes the ten non-State supported schools for neglected children. Because South Dakota had many cooperative programs, the total number of participating LEA's exceeds the number of approved Title I programs.

The breakdown of the 244 programs for FY 1970 is as follows:

(1) 96 regular school term programs.

(2) 8 summer school term programs.

(3) 140 regular school and summer school term programs.

The unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs for each term is shown in Table II.

TABLE II

GRADE LEVELS OF STUDENTS
PARTICIPATING IN TITLE I, ESEA
FY 1970

Grade Levels	Regular School Term		Summer School Term	
	Number Enrolled In Public Schools	Number Enrolled In Private Schools	Number Enrolled In Public Schools	Number Enrolled In Private Schools
Prekindergarten	30	-	49	15
Kindergarten	3,776	116	395	21
Grade 1	1,803	187	970	72
Grade 2	2,126	185	1,173	84
Grade 3	2,414	259	1,269	113
Grade 4	2,348	229	1,167	106
Grade 5	2,267	211	1,039	91
Grade 6	1,998	208	871	93
Grade 7	1,754	180	515	55
Grade 8	1,590	194	472	46
Grade 9	1,136	231	226	28
Grade 10	818	163	188	31
Grade 11	666	122	148	32
Grade 12	574	74	70	10
Spec. Ed.	267	14	99	8
TOTALS	23,567	2,373	8,651	805

STATE DEPARTMENT STAFF VISITS

During Fiscal Year 1970, Title I staff personnel visited 89 local Title I programs. Several of these programs were visited by one or more staff members at various times throughout the year.

Table III illustrates the number of SEA Title I staff visits by purpose. Staff members are designated by capital letters.

TABLE III

STAFF VISITS

SEA TITLE I STAFF	PURPOSE				
	Information Dissemination	Planning Development	Operation	Accounting Procedures	Evaluation
"A"	2	19	4	0	4
"B"	2	11	29	2	9
"C"		3		4	
TOTAL	4	33	33	6	13

Telephonic communication between the SEA and the LEA's has solved many problems concerning guideline clarification, program design, finance, and evaluation.

All program visits by SEA Title I Staff were made on a need determined by the SEA or upon request by the LEA's. Three professional Title I staff members participated in the planning and development of the 244 programs.

It is felt that these visits are mutually beneficial. They enable the SEA staff to keep abreast of developments in the field, and provide the opportunity to pass on to other LEA's particular techniques and procedures which have been found to be especially successful in dealing with unusual problems or situations as they relate to Title I activities in any given area.

CHANGES IN SEA PROCEDURES IN THE LAST THREE YEARS

Although there have been no drastic changes in the State Educational Agency, there has been an attempt to improve the quality of Title I programs in South Dakota. Some of these attempts are:

-- Increased SEA staff to:
   - Offer more service to LEA's.
   - Monitor individual programs to insure compliance with Guidelines.
   - Help LEA's in phasing out questionable activities.

-- Continued emphasis on the design and development of programs for educationally deprived children in the early elementary school.

-- Coordinated effort of Title I consultants and school district personnel in improving FY 1970 programs.

-- Development of application narrative supplements and evaluation instruments to better suit the problems of South Dakota.

To insure proper participation of nonpublic school children the State Educational Agency has:

-- Included in the application instrument written evidence by the LEA concerning the involvement of nonpublic school personnel in the development of the program.

-- Participated in securing a more liberal opinion from the State Attorney General on participation of nonpublic school children. This Attorney General's opinion has increased nonpublic school participation.

-- Increased communication with nonpublic school authorities to insure them of awareness of the Guidelines.

Modification of local projects is an ongoing program. Where State and local evaluations show little measurable gain, school districts were encouraged to try different approaches. This has resulted in:

-- More visitations between school districts in order to observe and implement many innovative practices.

-- Increased emphasis on preventative rather than remedial programs.

-- More hiring of personnel in lieu of purchasing equipment.

-- More efficient program implementation and planning to meet the most pressing needs of eligible children.

-- Greater use of prior evaluation in planning.

-- Ongoing evaluation of the needs of Title I students.

EFFECT UPON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

The evaluation reports from 244 programs indicate an impact on reading and the concern in this area. Enough comparable information was provided on several standardized tests to permit some descriptive comparison of changes in reading achievement by Title I participants. Table IV through X will reflect achievement in reading for grades one through eight.

TABLE IV

Gates-McGinitie
Regular School Term

GRADE LEVEL		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GAIN BY GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTING IN EACH QUARTILE, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL NORMS			
				25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above
1-3	Pre:	272	1.177 Gain	154	88	22	8
	Post:			75	102	69	26
4-6	Pre:	298	1.275 Gain	152	121	18	7
	Post:			80	143	57	18
7-8	Pre:	88	1.067 Gain	30	39	8	11
	Post:			17	38	18	15

TABLE V

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
Regular School Term

GRADE LEVEL		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GAIN BY GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTING IN EACH QUARTILE, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL NORMS			
				25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above
1-3	Pre:	142	.761 Gain	42	66	24	10
	Post:			27	55	41	19
4-6	Pre:	548	.796 Gain	193	226	72	57
	Post:			134	234	115	65
7-8	Pre:	212	.720 Gain	80	75	40	17
	Post:			57	83	47	25

TABLE VI

Durrell-Sullivan
Regular School Term

GRADE		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GAIN BY GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTING IN EACH QUARTILE, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL NORMS			
				25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above
1-3	Pre:	105	1.342 Gain	26	46	28	5
	Post:			4	36	43	22
4-6	Pre	198	.966	63	72	44	19
	Post:			42	62	57	37
7-8	Pre:		Gain				
	Post:						

TABLE VII

California Reading
Regular School Term

GRADE LEVEL		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GAIN BY GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTING IN EACH QUARTILE, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL NORMS			
				25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above
1-3	Pre:	85	.698 Gain	34	21	22	8
	Post:			14	22	19	30
4-6	Pre:	76	.733 Gain	33	26	6	11
	Post:			18	24	16	18
7-8	Pre:		Gain				
	Post:						

TABLE VIII

SRA
Regular School Term

GRADE		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GAIN BY GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTING IN EACH QUARTILE, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL NORMS			
				25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above
1-3	Pre:	49	.939 Gain	15	21	12	1
	Post:			12	17	15	5
4-6	Pre:	73	.949 Gain	31	31	10	1
	Post:			19	36	16	2
7-8	Pre:	34	.663 Gain	16	7	11	
	Post:			10	16	5	3

TABLE IX

Metropolitan
Regular School Term

GRADE LEVEL		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GAIN BY GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTING IN EACH QUARTILE, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL NORMS			
				25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above
1-3	Pre:	79	1.123 Gain	14	25	28	12
	Post:			9	15	34	21
4-6	Pre:	49	1.083 Gain	20	21	8	
	Post:			14	28	7	
7-8	Pre:		Gain				
	Post:						

TABLE X

Stanford Achievement
Regular School Term

GRADE		NUMBER OF STUDENTS	GAIN BY GRADE EQUIVALENT AVERAGE	PERCENT OF STUDENTS TESTING IN EACH QUARTILE, ACCORDING TO NATIONAL NORMS			
				25th %ile and below	26th to 50th %ile	51st to 75th %ile	76th %ile and above
1-3	Pre:	99	.633 Gain	45	38	15	1
	Post:			39	56	3	1
4-6	Pre:	158	.925 Gain	101	51	6	
	Post:			82	67	9	
7-8	Pre:	60	1.075 Gain	38	20	2	
	Post:			24	29	7	

Each school district designs its testing program using as a guide the philosophy of the administrative staff, guidance counselor, and Title I staff members. South Dakota does not have a State-wide testing program for the elementary grades nor does it recommend or discourage the selection of a particular type of test.

The most commonly used tests in Title I programs during the 1969-70 school year are listed below.

Reading:

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
Gates-McGinitie
SRA
Durrell-Sullivan
California Reading
Stanford Diagnostic
Metropolitan
Stanford Achievement
Iowa Silent Reading
Nelson Reading

Matnematics:

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
SRA
California Arithmetic
Stanford Achievement
California Algebra Aptitude
Stanford Arithmetic
Wide Range Achievement
New Mathematics Diagnostic
Metropolitan Achievement

Kindergarten:

Metropolitan
Peabody Picture Vocabulary
ABC Inventory
Lee-Clark Reading Readiness
SRA Primary Mental Abilities
California Test of Mental Abilities
Early Detection Inventory
Detroit Kindergarten
Detroit Beginning 1st Grade
Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading

English:

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
Stanford Achievement
Metropolitan Achievement
Iowa Test of Educational Development
Stanford High School English
Test of Academic Progress
Essentials of English
Purdue High School English

In the LEA evaluation, each program director listed the major objectives of each activity. They also checked the appropriate area as to their success in meeting these objectives. Tables XI, XII, and XIII reflect the most common objectives and the success in meeting each.

TABLE XI

Most Common
Reading Objectives

Objectives	Reported Totals		
	Little or no Progress	Some Progress	Substantial Progress
To improve comprehension	3	59	34
To improve performance in reading	10	66	43
To improve verbal functioning	4	82	43
To improve work-study skills	4	57	26
To develop reading speed and accuracy	7	14	10
To improve classroom performance in several academic areas + reading	5	33	12

TABLE XII

Most Common
Kindergarten Objectives

Objectives	Reported Totals		
	Little or no Progress	Some Progress	Substantial Progres
To prepare children for the 1st grade	1	16	42
To improve motor coordination skills	1	9	23
To improve reading readiness		2	22
To improve number readiness		3	14
To increase interest in school	1	4	17

TABLE XIII

Most Common
Mathematics Objectives

Objectives	Reported Totals		
	Little or no Progress	Some Progress	Substantial Progress
To improve basic mathematic skills	2	8	3
To increase interest and motivation	1	12	6
To improve work-study skills	3	7	2
To improve classroom performance in mathematics		6	3

Based on information presented in this report, on discussions by State officials with educators, and on appraisals made by State officals during on-site visits of programs, the following observations are made related to the impact and common characteristics of effective Title I programs.

-- The practice of teachers designing tasks commensurate in difficulty with the abilities of the students so that success for every child might be realized.

-- Lowering of the pupil-teacher ratio which provides teacher time for meeting the individual needs and differences of children through individualized and small group instruction.

-- Evidence that the parents of educationally and economically deprived children are becoming more involved in school affairs.

-- Programming is being concentrated more and more on younger children. With emphasis placed on readiness or preventive measures, the need for remedial or corrective measures should be reduced in future years.

-- Planned inservice for teachers and teacher aides.

-- Funds expended for salaries of program employees and in-service training have increased steadily. This indicates less is being expended for supplies and equipment.

The task of identifying the characteristics of Title I programs that are most effective in improving educational achievement is the most difficult task in the total evaluation process. Due to the fact that in any Title I program several factors are operative at the same time, one cannot really pinpoint a clear-cut one to one ratio between cause and effect. It is for this reason that a response to this question must be a general one, which although descriptive of the majority of Title I programs, is not necessarily descriptive of any Title I program in particular.

The South Dakota evaluation instrument did not emphasize the relationship of successful programs to cost for Fiscal Year 1970. Thus it is difficult to document the fact through objective evidence that effectiveness is related to cost. However, our most successful programs appear to be those in which large sums of money were spent on a relatively small number of children.

EFFECTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

The effect of Title I programs on the administrative structure and educational practices of the State Education Agency are listed below:

-- Closer coordination between various divisions of the Department of Public Instruction.

-- Increased awareness for the need of specialists in all areas of instruction.

-- Increased service given to Local Education Agencies.

On the local level the effect of Title I programs has created changes in school procedure such as:

-- Many schools have included in their administrative structure a staff member whose main responsibility lies with Federal Programs.

-- The use of teacher aides and individualized instruction to meet the needs of educationally deprived students.

-- Ongoing inservice meetings for both the teachers and the teacher aides.

-- Additional contacts with parents and the formation of Parental Involvement Committees.

The SEA has placed much emphasis on cooperation between the LEA and nonpublic schools. Some of the effects of this cooperation are:

-- Nonpublic schools have been included in planning of Title I programs.

-- The sharing of equipment and supplies of the LEA with the nonpublic schools.

-- Shared inservice activities by the nonpublic schools.

-- A closer working arrangement with LEA's.

-- The sharing of specialized personnel.

ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED

Fiscal year 1970 found no State funds used to augment Title I programs in South Dakota.

An outstanding example of the coordination of Title I activities with those of other federally funded programs was the Summer School Family Involvement Program at the Eagle Butte Independent School #3.

The aim of this summer program was to devote as much time as possible with the individual child and also the parent to better establish a rapport that will lead to a greater desire for achievement.

Studies on dropout problems, as well as underachievement, have shown that the children who live in the Indian communities have the greater problem in adjusting to acceptable academic criteria. Many times the lack of parental influence also affects the child's attitude toward education.

The Title I Family Involvement summer program involved the communities of Eagle Butte, LaPlant, Cherry Creek, and Red Scaffold. This program was not only rewarding to all who participated in its operation, but, most important of all, it was enthusiastically accepted by the youngsters.

The program's success was mostly due to the services of six Catholic fathers who worked with the school district. These young men (all were from the East coast) did a tremendous job of teaching not only in academic areas, but in helping the children understand themselves.

Another outstanding feature of this program was the marvelous cooperation of many agencies in developing and carrying out the goals set by staff, parents, and children.

One of the greatest contributors was the Bureau of Indian Affairs Education Administrative personnel. The school and the BIA worked especially close at Cherry Creek where the BIA has a similar program. By using BIA and school staff, the children had the most exceptional educational and social experiences of any of the communities. The BIA also furnished food for the programs at Eagle Butte, LaPlant, and Red Scaffold, as well as transportation facilities when the children took field trips.

The Adult Basic Education program assisted in the summer program. The children were delighted with ceramics, (an adult program) and the instructor helped them make many beautiful things which they could take home.

Instructors in Adult Basic Education also helped in the schools remedial classes.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) also helped the school by providing aides in the communities.

The coordinator of the program felt that the close association of all agencies who combined their efforts into one program made the summer program the most rewarding of any program so far administered.

The program served approximately 100 children, the majority of whom were Indian children, living on the Cheyenne River Reservation.

COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN ENROLLED IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

There were 38 programs implemented providing activities for 3,178 children participating from nonpublic schools.

All programs were conducted on public school premises. There was no appreciable difference between the quality of programs involving nonpublic school children and public school children.

Twenty-one of the programs operated during the regular school term and summer school. Five programs operated during the regular term only and two operated during the summer only. In addition there were ten programs operated in non-State schools for neglected children.

Some adaptations to meet the specific educational needs of educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools were:

-- Reassignment of Title I staff to meet the needs of nonpublic school children.

-- Bus transportation was provided by the LEA's for nonpublic school children.

-- Schedules were modified to include nonpublic school children.

The State Attorney General's opinion on participation of nonpublic school children increased participation from nonpublic schools in Title I programs in the public schools.

Joint planning with nonpublic school officials became part of the school district application.

COORDINATED TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Project evaluations indicated that 135 programs had conducted some type of training for their Title I personnel. The type of training ranged from one day pre-school meetings to intensive school year programs.

There were 1,068 professional staff members and 438 non-professional personnel receiving training. The total cost for inservice training for FY 1970 was $55,675.34.

The most frequently reported patterns for training programs and inservice training were:

-- Individualizing instruction and organizing the year for reading.

-- Small group instruction and related instructional activities.

-- Humanizing education.

-- Team teaching and utilization of teacher aides.

-- Understanding Indian cultures.

-- General orientation to Title I programs.

-- The use of instructional equipment and materials.

The teacher and teacher aide responses to the training program revealed that the effectiveness of the inservice training had been reasonably effective. They encouraged the continuation of such training programs.

Specific examples of outstanding joint training programs are:

Castlewood Public School
Castlewood, South Dakota

The workshop was provided by the Title III Lake Region Educational Planning Center. Sixty-two teachers and teacher aides from 22 different schools attended this one day workshop. The workshop was conducted by five members of the Lake Region Center staff.

Aberdeen Public Schools
Aberdeen, South Dakota

This three-day teacher aide workshop was held on the Northern State College campus. It was financed through a grant from the South Dakota State Department of Public Instruction under D.E.P.D.A., Section B-2 "Attracting and Qualifying Teachers and Aides." Thirty-nine teacher aides participated in this program.

Sisseton Public Schools
Sisseton, South Dakota

The Sisseton Public School hosted a two day teacher-teacher aide training program. The participating schools were Corona, New Effington, Rosholt, Sisseton, Summit, Veblen, Waubay, Wilmot, and the Enemy Swim Day School.

Approximately 234 teachers and 50 aides participated during this two-day workshop.

Agencies involved were from the Department of Public Instruction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Title III Center.

The areas of concentration for teachers and teacher aides in the three programs are as follows:

Teachers:

-- Art as a means of communication.

-- Bi-cultural communications

-- Small group instruction

-- Prescriptive teaching

-- Early childhood education

-- Team teaching

-- Humanizing education

-- Individualizing primary math

-- Motor skills development

-- Individualizing primary reading

-- How to individualize with your present materials

Teacher Aides:

-- Responsibility as an Aide

-- Operation of Audio Visual Materials

-- Operation of Audio Visual Equipment

-- Aide-Teacher Relationships

-- Child growth and development

-- Problems in reading

COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Shown below in Table XIV are the number of persons involved during the 1969-70 school year.

TABLE XIV

COMMUNITY AND PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Groups Involved	Number
Parents of Diadvantaged Children	1699
Other Parents	441
Community Action Personnel	79
Head Start Personnel	25
Superintendent (Public School)	137
Principal (Public School)	178
Teaching Staff (Public School)	868
Superintendent (Private School)	5
Principal (Private School)	22
Teaching Staff (Private School)	37
Civic Leaders and Others	87

An outstanding example of parental invovlement in Title I programs is illustrated by Todd County Independent School District.

A Parent Advisory Committee (PAC) for schools on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, participating in Project Follow Through and Title I Programs, was organized. This PAC is composed of elected low-income parents who have children in the local schools, elected representatives from the Bureau of Indian Affairs dormitories, and appointed members from the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, BIA, C.A.P., local schools, and the Public Health Service.

Each elected member has one vote. Appointed members do not have voting privileges, since they act in an advisory capacity. This PAC, commonly referred to as the large PAC, reflects representation from five school communities in the Todd County Independent School District. These five school communities are Mission, O'Kreek, Rosebud, Spring Creek, and He Dog. This PAC is charged with the responsibility of establishing local PAC groups in the individual school communities.

Representatives are apportioned as follows: Mission, (6), Rosebud, (4), Spring Creek, (2), He Dog, (2), and O'Kreek (2). The local PAC groups nominate and elect their representatives to the large PAC. This is done by written ballot. Members of the large PAC are elected for two year terms with no more than one half of the membership being elected in any given year. Non-voting advisory members are appointed annually.

The large PAC holds twelve meetings each year. Special meetings may be called at the discretion of the PAC chairman.

The PAC has broad powers of recommendation over Educational Policy, finances, employment, and operation of programs. The following committees are established by PAC; grievance committee, employment committee, evaluation committee, and budget committee.

Each of the five aforementioned Title I schools has an active local PAC. This PAC is made up of all parents of children in the local school. Regularly scheduled monthly meetings are held. Officers are elected for terms of one year.

These local PAC's make recommendations to the school board with reference to local policy, implementation and operation of programs, budget and finance, and employment of personnel.

The PAC screens para-professional personnel applications, conducts interviews, and makes recommendation to the Board of Education with reference to employment and re-employment of such personnel.

The local PAC makes recommendations to school officials with reference to the type of Title I programs which are worthwhile and necessary for the education of handicapped children. The two most recent programs to be instituted in the Todd County Title I Program as a result of PAC action and advice are expansion of dormitory tutoring and expansion of an evening intra-mural physical education program.

All aspects of school and community educational programs are topics of discussion at PAC meetings.

Parent-Field Workers, who act as liaison people between home and school, are employed in each of the five school communities. These field workers explain school programs to parents, do social work, and bring parents and school personnel together in an effort to improve communications. The services of the field workers are coordinated by a Parent Coordinator. This coordinator is selected by the large PAC and funded through Project Follow Through.

The local PAC's provide valuable voluntary assistance to school personnel in facilitating school instructional activities. Parent activities, both social and instructional, are planned and implemented by local parent committees.

Many parents of Follow Through and Title I children are employed as teacher aides, data collectors, and field workers. Still others have taken the inservice training programs to be eligible to act as sustitutes when needed.

Table XV illustrates the major problem areas for the Local Education Agencies.

TABLE XV

MAJOR PROBLEM AREAS
1970 Academic School Year Program

Number	Problem Areas
81	Limitations imposed by Federal and State regulations and guidelines
10	Negative reaction in the community to Federal funds
42	Identification of pupil needs
47	Designing of projects to meet pupil needs
66	Inadequate planning time
2	Cooperation with private and nonpublic schools
28	Completion of project applications
72	Excessive paper work
42	Pre-service and/or inservice training of staff
33	Shortage of administrative staff to plan and supervise the program
58	Lack of school facilities or space for carrying out the program
26	Inability to secure equipment, materials, and supplies on time
20	Delay between submission and approval of program
80	Delay of announcement of allocation amounts
0	Delay in financial payments
62	Inadequate Title I funds
0	Fiscal accounting procedures
42	Lack of appropriate evaluation devices
19	Inability to obtain quailified staff

FINANCIAL DATA

The Title I grants and the amounts approved for low-income schools, institutions, and migrant program for Fiscal Year 1970 are reflected in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI

ESEA TITLE I GRANTS AND APPROVED PROJECT AMOUNTS

	Grant Amount	Approved Project Amount
Local School Districts	$ 5,638,197.20	$ 5,144,950.28
Institutions for Neglected Children	291,891.80	257,772.88
State Institutions for Handicapped Children	144,852.00	135,739.48
State Institutions for Delinquent Children	38,892.00	34,059.00
State Program for Migrant Children	24,805.00	19,600.00
TOTALS	$ 6,138,638.00	$ 5,592,121.64

The student participation and expenditures for instructional activities and supportive services for Fiscal Year 1970 are shown by Table XVII.

TABLE XVII

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES PARTICIPATION FOR LEA'S AND INSTITUTIONS FOR NEGLECTED CHILDREN

	Number of Students	Estimated Cost	Number of Students	Estimated Cost
INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES				
Art	1,451	$ 54,618.00	341	$ 14,823.37
Business Education	45	10,824.00	77	5,279.62
Cultural Enrichment	2,361	155,079.00	657	20,409.62
English-Reading	13,657	1,542,841.00	5,574	229,377.98
English-Second Language	12	135.00	68	2,459.00
English-Speech	1,236	58,834.00	76	1,270.00
English-Other Lang. Arts	1,965	189,083.00	704	39,353.00
Foreign Language	0	0	11	610.00
Phys. Educ. - Recreation	2,012	47,483.00	665	10,009.25
Home Economics	25	2,493.00	0	0
Industrial Arts	216	17,886.00	35	1,390.00
Math	3,588	205,608.00	3,888	161,859.55
Music	1,434	33,190.00	312	6,305.00
Natural Science	1,303	61,781.00	442	18,043.82
Social Science	1,286	46,574.00	189	8,781.00
Other Vocational Education	10	9,520.00	0	0
Special Act. for Handicapped	123	29,891.00	132	12,572.00
Pre-K. and Kindergarten	3,534	521,346.00	395	30,335.00
Other Instructional Act.	1,377	152,178.00	394	22,907.00
Gen. Academic Improvement with the Use of Aides	5,766	494,713.00	2,017	23,990.00
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES				
Attendance	505	4,136.00	0	0
Clothing	0	0	4	17.00
Food	674	2,537.00	1,697	8,421.75
Guidance Counseling	3,140	108,847.00	1,075	15,165.00
Health-Dental	810	12,702.00	445	1,340.00
Health-Medical	3,877	54,152.00	186	2,458.00
Library	2,219	17,590.00	778	7,923.00
Psychological	332	11,302.00	14	100.00
School Social Work	322	13,550.00	0	0
Speech Therapy	306	28,516.00	382	16,425.73
Transportation	1,623	94,442.00	2,080	42,464.17
Spec. Services for Handicapped	197	14,932.00	0	0
Other Services	1,329	51,146.00	578	6,126.00

Students in the preceding table are counted more than once. For example, a student who participated in art would be counted once. If the same student participated in English-Reading also, he would be counted again, under the English-Reading activity.